

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed January 9, 2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Please note the change in the Attorney Docket number to “IGT1P277/P-798”.

The 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 has been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Namely, Claim 20 has been amended as follows: “wherein the control module is configured to simultaneously generate and send wagering events to more than two game terminals.” Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-13, 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Acres et al. (US Patent 6,257,981). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 7, and 15 are independent claims.

According to the M.P.E.P. § 2131, a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.

With respect to independent Claim 1, the office action states:

“Acres discloses floor controls that contains a memory to store machine readable game codes and a processor to execute said codes to offer special games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of terminals (col. 7: 7-35).”

With respect to independent Claims 7 and 15, the office action states:

“Acres discloses floor controls (control module) that contains a memory to store a machine readable game codes and a processor to execute said codes to offer special games and bonuses related to the games to plurality of terminals (col. 7:7-

35), and multiple gaming terminals to concurrently present wagering event to multiple players (figure 1, wherein multiple wagering terminals with display for displaying wagering information are disclosed).”

Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons, among others, discussed below. The Examiner improperly equates the floor controller to the control module or processor of independent Claims 1, 7, and 15.

Independent Claim 1 provides for “a processor configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal.” Independent Claim 7 provides for “a control module having a processor, configured to execute software code, the software code configured to generate the first and second wagering events”. Independent Claim 15 provides for “a processor to control two or more game terminals and present two or more games to two or more players.” Thus, a single processor or control module may be used to present two or more games on two or more different game terminals. This is further supported in the Specification whereby the “control module 60 comprises a CPU 66 that is, configured to control the game offered on the first game terminal 62 and the second game terminal 64. The CPU 66 communicates with a memory 68. In this embodiment the memory 68 is configured to store machine readable code that is written to present a game to the first game terminal 62 and the second game terminal 64.” (Specification, [0036]). This “results in a cost saving on a per game terminal basis or on a per game basis because certain devices, such as the processor and memory can be shared and configured to control multiple games” (Specification, [0007]).

Acres teaches a “floor controller … directly connected to both the high speed network 38 and a plurality of gaming devices. The floor controller is responsible for monitoring the activity of each of the gaming devices connected thereto and reporting this activity to the database 32. In addition, the floor controller is responsible for transmitting a reconfiguration command to a selected one or more of the gaming devices during certain bonus conditions.” (Col. 18, lines 62-67 through col. 19, lines 1-2). Thus, the floor controller merely monitors the activity of the gaming devices and transmits a reconfiguration command and can not be equated to the control module of the present invention. The floor controller does not have a processor or a memory,

“configured to execute software code, the software code configured to generate the first and second wagering events” as claimed in Claim 7 and similarly in Claims 1 and 15.

Accordingly, the floor controller of Acres simply monitors the activities of the gaming machines and transmits a reconfiguration command. The floor controller is not “configured to access the memory to execute the machine readable game code to concurrently offer a game to the first player at the first game terminal and the second player at the second game terminal” as claimed in Claim 1, and similarly in Claims 7 and 15. Thus, it can not be said that Acres anticipate the claimed invention. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

As to dependent claims 2-6, 8-13, 16-20, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Acres in view of Stepan et al. (US Patent 4,621,814). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 7. Thus, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claim being allowable, the dependent claim must also be allowable. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited and Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/Adrienne Yeung/
Adrienne Yeung
Registration No. 44,000

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001